## E1A6SANC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 ELVIS SANTANA, et al., 4 Plaintiffs, 5 13 CV 1628(LGS) V. 6 FISHLEGS, LLC., et al., 7 Defendants. 8 New York, N.Y. 9 January 10, 2014 3:45 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. LORNA G. SCHOFIELD, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 LEE LITIGATION GROUP, PLLC Attorneys for Plaintiffs 15 BY: C.K. LEE 16 CLIFTON BUDD & DEMARIA, LLP 17 Attorneys for Defendants BY: ARTHUR J. ROBB 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

E1A6SANC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called; in open court)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your name for the record.

MR. LEE: C.K. Lee for the plaintiff.

MR. ROBB: Arthur Robb, Clifton Budd & DeMaria defendants.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Counsel, we're here for a discovery dispute. I have your letters dated December 26th and January 8th. Just for the record, Mr. Robb, my rules provide for a response within three days of the receipt of the letter from a discovery letter. In any event, I have it. I have read it and hopefully there will not be future discovery disputes. I would like to do it fairly quickly because I have another matter at 1:00. Before we address these one by one are there any that have been resolved? You can refer to them by number.

MR. LEE: Your Honor, unfortunately we haven't. had scheduled to meet here a half hour before the conference, but Mr. Robb never bothered showing up. So I waited for a half hour.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEE: Here we are.

MR. ROBB: We haven't and I do apologize. I do have other matters. I wasn't able to get here sooner than the scheduled time.

THE COURT: Let's talk about, No. 1, pay stubs.

Mr. Robb said all of the information that is requested and needed is on the payroll records.

Is that the case?

MR. LEE: Well, the issue, your Honor, for pay stubs is the information actually needs to be on the pay stub.

Whether it is on the payroll system or not is not necessarily dispositive it is on the pay stub and employees have received pay stubs with that information. I have no idea. That goes to the penalty under the Wage Theft Prevention Act. So saying it is on the payroll doesn't really do anything.

THE COURT: Because what you need are the stubs not just the information on the stubs?

MR. LEE: That's right.

THE COURT: Mr. Robb, what is your response?

MR. ROBB: Your Honor, I think it is a disingenuous position that the plaintiff offers. Mr. Lee handles many, many wage-an-hour cases. He understands what the report was provided by the payroll company. It is a week by week check detail. It takes the information contained on the pay stub and puts it in a summary report form. So we don't have to look at 52 weeks worth of pay stubs. We have one report.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this then: Why don't you produce, say, five pay stubs that correspond to entries on the payroll records to illustrate that the pay stubs contain all of the information on the payroll record as I think you just

explained to me. If that is the case, then Mr. Lee can rely on the payroll records as reflecting what is on the pay stubs. If there is a discrepancy, then you should talk to each other and try work it out.

MR. ROBB: I have no problem with that, your Honor, the only thing I would say, and I don't know this with certainty, but I am fairly confident in representing that neither the defendants nor their payroll company keeps physical pay stubs. The pay stubs are generated from the system where the report is generated. So in order for us to produce pay stubs, all we are going to be doing is taking the report and the data from the report that Mr. Lee has and printing it out in pay stub form. So this seems like an exercise of futility.

THE COURT: In other words, they would be created after the fact.

Mr. Lee, is there some way we can deal with that

MR. LEE: I don't think that is accurate, your Honor.

As Mr. Robb states, I have done many types of these similar

cases, and companies like Paychecks and others are able to go

back into their system and provide it. I am not sure what he

is referring to.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this: Mr. Robb, if you could make inquiries and try to come up with the five pay stubs to illustrate that there is no discrepancy between the pay stubs and the report and if that is the case then Mr. Lee will

be able to rely on your representation that what was on the pay stubs and provided to employees is what is on the payroll report.

MR. LEE: Is it possible to have for the pay stubs he is going to be providing as of May 2011 for different employees?

THE COURT: What he needs to do is provide pay stubs not that are current but that correspond to the time period and the payroll records that he is giving you. I will give you five from that time period.

MR. LEE: Great. Thank you.

THE COURT: So Document Request 2, it sounds like you need to talk about the sampling methodology and figure out whether there is a way you can resolve that.

Go head, Mr. Lee.

MR. LEE: I did provide a proposal of them providing 10 people per restaurant for a six-year period as of May of each year. His response was he doesn't like this and that --

THE COURT: I think his hope was that you would then talk to each other and figure out what to do. That obviously hasn't happened.

MR. LEE: I tried. He didn't bother showing up. He never returned my calls.

THE COURT: I am going to order you to meet and confer on this and whatever other open issues you have not had a meet

1 and confer about.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Robb.

MR. ROBB: I will avoid the ad hominem attacks, your Honor, but the approach I would favor is 216(b) notices are going out, I think today, depending on plaintiff's counsel. The approach that I would favor is as opt-ins join the case, we will inevitably produce employment records for those individuals. I would favor that we use those individuals as the samples so that we're not duplicating efforts.

THE COURT: Does that work for you, Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: That's fine.

THE COURT: So No. 2 is resolved. No. 3 regarding the 500-dollar jurisdictional requirement, it sounds like there are a couple of issues here. One is the jurisdictional requirement.

Mr. Robb, is it possible to stipulate? Is there a serious dispute on that?

MR. ROBB: There is not a serious dispute. I need the client to sign off on it. I expect we can work that out.

THE COURT: You will recommend to the client?

MR. ROBB: I will certainly recommend.

THE COURT: With regard to the information concerning common ownership and control, do you know whether the financial statements are consolidated?

MR. ROBB: I am awaiting response on that. I don't

know that to be the case.

THE COURT: What I will ask is that Mr. Lee pose and interrogatory that asks that question so that you don't have to provide all the information in the sense of information, but so that he gets the information that relates to common ownership and management that might be derived from them.

The same with Request No. 5, why don't you do that through interrogatories in the first instance. If you want to ask whether there are any common loans, leases, credit lines, contracts between or among the various companies. And then if there are, ask who signs them or whatever else you need to know. That may take care of that one.

Document Request No. 4 sounds like the same kind of sampling issue. Can we deal with that in the same way?

MR. LEE: Yes. As people opt in, that is fine.

THE COURT: Good. No. 6 is e-discovery. My individual Rule 2(a)(3) requires the parties to cooperate with regard to the search methodologies and so I would certainly ask the parties to discuss and agree on custodians, search terms for mass production files so that what is produced is actually useful and relevant and probative. Please keep in mind that the doctrine of proportionality, which is incorporated already in the federal rules, is what should govern. That is, that the effort and the costs that goes into extracting the information shouldn't exceed its usefulness given the size of the case and

the issues at stake. If there is a dispute about that, I will think about cost-shifting, but I would much rather do is see the parties come up with something that is narrow and tailored to the case.

MR. LEE: Yes, your Honor. I made a proposal and I have been waiting for him to give a counter-proposal.

THE COURT: The only thing that I would order is you spend an hour with each other to meet and confer about any remaining issues. If you resolve all the issues, then you don't have to spend the whole hour talking to each other. You can do that within the next two weeks.

MR. LEE: I have one more issue, your Honor. The parties had met and conferred on a lot of issues that we haven't brought to the Court's attention and the defendants had agreed to provide supplemental production by January 3. We have blown past that deadline.

THE COURT: What is the fact discovery deadline at the moment?

MR. LEE: I do apologize, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Robb, when do you expect that supplemental production to be ready.

MR. ROBB: I am hopeful to have further word by the client by early next week. Apparently there was some internal discussion. One of the complicating factors, as counsel is aware, the corporate HR director is out on maternity leave. So

other people are filling in. I was hopeful to have responsive information. This is what I communicated. I was hopeful to have it by 12:30, in which case I would be able to turn it around by 1:30. It didn't happen. I am told there will be meetings this week. Hopefully we can follow up by next week. THE COURT: Today is the 10th. If there are meetings this week, I will order production by the 17th. I will give you a little leverage with your clients to get them to prioritize it. MR. ROBB: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel. MR. LEE: Thank you, your Honor.